| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | 10/074,874 | FANSLER ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Mathieu D. Vargot | 1732 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u> | | |
| (1) Mathieu D. Vargot. | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Mr. Kokko</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 31 March 2004 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: The 112 against claim 31. | | |
| Claims discussed: 31 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: N/A | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Mr. Kokko agreed to add language previously added to claim 1 into claim 31 to correct any 112 problems with the forming of the polarizer. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| 1/ 11 . 1/ 0 | | |
| (Applications) (Applications) | nt/Applicant's Representative S | signature – if appropriate) |